McNamara Testifies For A Test Ban, P. 3

Khrushchev's Animus Against Independent-Minded Writers No New Phenomena, See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

VOL. XI, NO. 9 APRIL 15, 1963 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

Debasement of the Coinage and Corruption of The Word

Let's take it slow and easy, like a first grade class. We live in the free world. In fact we are the leader of the free world. The other world is a world of one party dictatorships. There people are denied the right to vote. If they try to demonstrate the police rush them off to jail. Or set the dogs upon them. That's bad. To combat such wickedness, we spend $50 billion a year on arms. We spare no expense anywhere to combat the forces of evil. Our armies, our secret agents, are on all the continents, alert. But somehow all these big words and high purposes seem to evaporate when things happen in Le Flore County, Mississippi, or Birmingham, Alabama, or Albany, Georgia. It's as if the Free World were a myth, a fairy tale, a bit of advertising copy not intended to be taken seriously. Men trying to exercise the right to vote are shot at. Men and women kneel to demonstrate in prayer and dogs are set upon them. Men are beaten, and then jailed for resisting arrest. They've even begun to arrest them for resisting the dogs.* The machinery of the State governments, their courts, their law enforcement officers, are mobilized to maintain rule by one party and one race. But Congress and the press, the lawmakers and the opinion makers, the White House and the churches, don't really get excited about this the way they do about events, let us say, in Berlin.

The U. S. and Free Elections

We have grown accustomed as a nation to living in a fine haze of big words nobody really takes seriously. This debasement of our ideological currency, this corruption of the word, confronts us on every hand. It's not the Negro alone to whom the Free World appears as a fraud. President Kennedy at Costa Rica had hardly finished calling for "an unyielding defense against all who seek to impose new tyrannies on the Americas" when a new military tyranny was established in Guatemala, the third in a year: First Argentina, then Peru, now Guatemala. In each case the military took over in fear of free elections. Though free elections bulk large in our official rhetoric, there is some evidence that we shared that fear. *CBS* April 4 and Bert Quint from Guatemala City in the New York *Herald-Tribune* April 7 both reported that the Guatemalan army chief, Peralta, made discreet soundings as to what the U.S. reaction would be before venturing to take power. Quint wrote that, like the Guatemalan army, the U.S. believed free elections would bring Juan José Arévalo to power again and "Washington felt he could not be trusted." Dictatorships are allowed to stage fake elections in Paraguay, Nicaragua and Haiti without U.S. interference or loss of Alliance for Progress aid. But free elections are stopped without protest from us, if not with our connivance, where we fear the results. The test is not whether Guatemalans trust Arévalo but whether we do. This is what people below the border call Yankee Imperialism.

The Alliance for Progress bathes Latin America in speeches calling for agrarian and social reform. Arévalo gave Guatemala some measure of both while he was President between 1945 and 1951. After the long night of the Ubico dictatorship (a very pleasant period for United Fruit Company), Arévalo gave Guatemalans a taste of civil liberties. Apparently this taste was not to our liking. Though the Communist Partty was never able to achieve legal status until after he left office and he even upheld the closing down of its paper, "Octubre";

(Continued on Page Four)

If Only The Holy Father Were In Guatemala

The U.S. seems to be feeling the kind of disquiet about the Vatican which marks our relations with Latin America. We want regimes which are liberal, but not too liberal, and particularly not liberal enough to have relations with Moscow. The new Ecumenical Council so far has been gratifyingly liberal, but the Pope's exchange of messages with Khrushchev and the audience he gave Adzhubei have raised questions. Time Magazine as always has been the first to ring the alarm. One reason for the visit here of Cardinal Bea, it reported April 5, was to "let the White House know the reasoning behind Pope John's surprising new willingness to negotiate with Communism." It quoted the Cardinal as telling a friend in Rome (who, of course, at once told it to Time), "The U.S. is angry now. I'm afraid they will soon be angrier." The Cardinal denied this when he was in Washington April 5. But two days later in the Washington Post, Chalmers Roberts wrote that while New Frontiersmen "deeply involved in countries with Catholic populations have been hopeful that more liberal Church views would aid these programs," they express concern "lest any feeling that the Pope might be going too far in any East-West diplomatic move might hinder the movement toward liberalization." In Latin America, liberals who go too far know what is in store for them. If similar methods were applied to Rome, our press would begin to describe the Pope as "left leaning." We might wake up one morning to learn that the Swiss Guards had taken over, assuring the U.S. that free elections would be held as soon as the College of Cardinals had been purged of suspect elements. They might even, with modest help from the CIA, arrange the election of someone like Francis Cardinal Spellman, guaranteed to make the Vatican safe for free enterprise again.

*** "Police Break Up Alabama March," said a headline in the New York Times April 8, "Birmingham Protest Ended as Negro Attacks Dog." The constitutional rights of the dog seem to be firmly established in Alabama.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ehrenbourg and Yevtushenko Scolded for Works Attacking Anti-Semitism

Khrushchev's Fresh Assault on Independent Writers No New Line

The fresh attacks Khrushchev has unleashed on Russia's more independent minded writers and artists cannot be dismissed as political maneuver to appease rightist opponents. His past pronouncements on art and literature have been more consistent than people realize. In 1957, when he had consolidated his power, Khrushchev lined up against the literary rebels who had made the years 1954-57 "an interval of freedom." Then, and at the 1959 Writers Congress, he attacked Dudintsev, whose "Not By Bread Alone" was one of the first novels of social protest to appear after Stalin died; Khrushchev called it, "a malodorous bouquet." In July 1960, he said those who charge that literature is fettered in the Soviet Union do not understand "the essence of our socialist system," its "monolithic unity." Khrushchev said Soviet writers and artists "find an inexhaustible source of creative inspiration in Party policy" and in this enjoy "a totally unrestricted freedom of creation." This mystical nonsense is indistinguishable from Stalin's.

When Conformity Is Revolutionary

The Writers Union of the USSR has just ended a four day conference with a letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party. This letter in its obsequious tone also recalls the Stalin era. "We are deeply grateful," it said, "to the Central Committee and to Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev personally, "for the timely criticism of such writers and artists who have deviated from the revolutionary and realistic traditions of Soviet art and for the wise directives as to the path to follow. . . ." But the erring writers to whom this letter refers are the very ones whose independent work had produced fresh hope. In this inverted vocabulary the words, like images in a mirror, must be taken in reverse. Those who rebelled against a dull conformity were accused of deviating from the "revolutionary" tradition while those who refused to varnish over the unpleasant aspects of Soviet life were accused of deviating from the "realistic"! The line of the writers' conference was set by Khrushchev in a speech of March 8. In the arts, his target was modernism of all kinds. In literature, he attacked the non-conformists, especially Ehrenbourg, their defender, and a group of younger poets, particularly Yevtushenko. This, too, was in a familiar pattern. Almost every Soviet writer of importance—from Mayakovsky and Babel to Zoshchenko and Akhmatova—has had trouble with the regime.

Khrushchev seemed most annoyed with those who have most shed credit on Russia. He criticized Yevtushenko and other writers for speaking too freely on their trips abroad, although they provided a refreshing contrast with the old days when every Soviet visitor sounded like a gramophone playing the same cracked party line record. They may not be allowed to travel abroad again until they have become more "mature." Ehrenbourg's 1954 novel, "The Thaw," gave its name to the springtime which followed the death of Stalin but Khrushchev attacked it as "incorrect," a deadly word in the Soviet lexicon. Khrushchev said he did not like the "literary image" of "the thaw," for this "gives a picture of a time of instability . . . of fluctuations of temperature . . . when it is difficult to foresee how and in what direction the weather will develop." "Now," he said, thanks to the liquidation of "the personality cult," "all people in our country breathe freely." But on the other hand this does not mean "the time has come for laissez faire" since the Party is "implacably . . . against any ideological vaccilation." How breathe freely while carefully watching your step?

Soviet Jewry, for one, will breathe less freely after this speech. For Khrushchev's greatest animus seems to be against its foremost defenders. "The Thaw" exposed the anti-Semitism of Stalin's latter years. Khrushchev's other main gripe was against Yevtushenko's Babi Yar. He could have praised this poem as evidence that a new Soviet generation was striving to wipe out such relics of the past as anti-Semitism. Instead Khrushchev seems to bear the poet a grudge for having dared to bring the subject up.

One Way to Correct "Distortions"

Premier Khrushchev complained in his speech to the writers and artists March 8 that "the position of the Jews in our country has been depicted in a distorted manner." One way to correct "distortions" would be to end the restrictions on the baking of matzoth (unleavened bread) for Passover. Even in the worst days of Stalin, the authorities were not so vindictive as to interfere with the baking of matzoth. It was in the Khrushchev era, in Kharkov, in 1957, that restrictions began to be applied. Last year, for the first time, they were enforced throughout the Soviet Union. The Jews not only are no longer allowed to use public bakeries for matzoth but have been forbidden to use the matzoth ovens on the premises of synagogues in Riga, Leningrad and Kiev. The Jews have been told they could make matzoth at home, but eight Jews in Moscow, including two women, have been arrested on charges of illegally selling home-made matzoth! All this hardly accords with Khrushchev's claim, "With us there is no Jewish question."

The Gratifying Support of Progressive People Elsewhere—Especially in Cuba

"We can only be gladdened by the right attitude toward the ideas of our party on the part of progressive people in foreign countries. Here, for instance, is what one of the most prominent representatives of Cuban culture, Juan Marinello, writes: 'Abstract art proceeds, in the final count, from frankly reactionary ideas and interests. It is necessary to fight against it, as is done in the Soviet Union."*

—Ilichev to Soviet artists and writers March 7.

"'They [the official Communist parties] are not revolutionaries but bureaucrats. They are satellites. . . . When Khrushchev criticizes abstract painting, the satellites here ask me to forbid abstract painting. But I tell them our adversaries are capitalism and imperialism, not the abstract painters.' . . . At this very moment, a big exhibition of abstract art is all the rage in Havana."

—Interview with Fidel Castro in Le Monde March 23.

*And as was done in one other country. "To Hitler," Wm. L. Shirer wrote in The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich, "all modern art was degenerate and senseless. One of his first acts after coming to power was to 'cleanse' Germany of its decadent art."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But He Sidestepped Senator Jackson's Charge We Have Been "Proliferating" Weapons

Secretary McNamara's Testimony in Favor of A Test Ban Treaty

This important testimony by the Secretary of Defense in closed session last February before the Senate Armed Services Committee has just been released with so-called security deletions:

SECRETARY MCNAMARA: At the present time it seems to me that it is very much in our interests to look ahead 5, 10 even 15 years, at the position of Communist China and at the position, as a matter of fact, of other powers in the world.

As a nation I personally believe we will be far less secure 15 years from now or 10 years from now if nations not now possessing independent nuclear arms do then possess them.

One of the major objectives of the test ban in my opinion should be to deter the further proliferation of independent nuclear forces, [deleted]. I don't mean to imply that a test ban of the kind currently being discussed will, without question, accomplish that objective, but I believe it would take us a step closer to it, and furthermore we could experiment with it for a time to determine whether we were accomplishing the objective. That to me is the major appeal of a test ban.

SEN. JACKSON (D. Wash): Do you seriously believes that an agreement between the U.S. and the Soviets would deter the Chinese from going ahead and achieving a nuclear device?

SECRETARY MCNAMARA: I think there is a substantial possibility that it would.

SENATOR JACKSON: Mr. Secretary, might I just observe that while there was a test moratorium between the Soviets and the U.S., the French went ahead and tested.

SECRETARY MCNAMARA: They did. They did indeed.

SENATOR JACKSON: So I mean we can't even control the French. How can we expect the Chinese to listen to the Russians?

SECRETARY MCNAMARA: I think there is considerable evidence that the Russians have been helping the Chinese in development of their nuclear weapons. I say have been, and I don't mean are today.

SENATOR JACKSON: The evidence is, I understand, they have withdrawn technicians.

SECRETARY MCNAMARA: I think there is considerable evidence that they have, but I would imagine that as the years go by they will resume their assistance to China, unless there is a test ban. In any event, that to me is one of the major reasons for entering into a test ban.

SENATOR JACKSON: In that same sense I must say that we have been guilty of proliferation. [Deleted].

SECRETARY MCNAMARA: No, sir, I don't believe so.

SENATOR JACKSON: On some of these sites and bases where you have got a couple of people around [deleted], if they wanted to take over the devices, they wouldn't be able to do so?

SECRETARY MCNAMARA: I know this has been a matter of concern to the Joint Committee [on Atomic Energy] for some time. . . .

SENATOR JACKSON: Mr. Secretary, isn't it a fair rule to lay down that the art of concealment proceeds forward much faster than the art of detection? . . .

SECRETARY MCNAMARA: I don't believe it is fair to say so.

SENATOR JACKSON: I am talking about underground tests.

SECRETARY MCNAMARA: Right.

SENATOR JACKSON: With all of the devices.

SECRETARY MCNAMARA: Right. I would say that to a layman, as I am, the art of detection has advanced more rapidly than the art of concealment in the last 18 months.

SENATOR JACKSON: Who supports this position? I would be curious. You and I are laymen in this field. I don't know anything about it. I just listen to the experts.

SECRETARY MCNAMARA: I don't know that I have discussed this particular question, the rapidity of the advance of the art of concealment in relation to that of detection of underground explosions with any expert, but I give you my personal observation based on an evaluation of both concealment and detection techniques over the last 18 months. I would be happy to have experts made available.

SENATOR JACKSON (who opposes a test ban): Mr. Secretary, let's just forget about that.

Army Chiefs for Atmospheric Testing

Sen. SYMINGTON (D. Mo): General Wheeler, do you think nuclear testing in the atmosphere is necessary for the security of the United States?

Gen. Earle G. WHEELER (Chief of Staff, US Army): I think the answer to that has to be 'Yes', Mr. Chairman. It seems to me that as long as the Soviets proceed with these tests of theirs that we must do everything we can to keep up with them. I do not profess to be an expert in the nuclear field. However, on a recent trip out to the Nevada test site I was told that the underground testing had proved to be far more valuable than many people had ever anticipated, but still there are certain things that we must know in order to get the best mix and the best capabilities from our weapons. . . .

Sen. SYMINGTON: Mr. Secretary, do you agree with the position of Gen. Wheeler?

Secretary of the Army Cyrus R. VANCE: I do, sir.

—Senate Armed Services Committee.

Pentagon's Top Scientific Research Chief Sees No Security in Arms Race

Sen. THURMOND (D. S.C.): Should not we, in view of their goal of world domination and their past record of bad faith, take no chances whatever and go forward and try to stay ahead of them in every way possible in testing and in armaments and in development?

Dr. Harold Brown (Director of Research and Engineering, Defense Dept.): I think that in the absence of agreements which carry enough inspection so we can be sure they are lived up to, we should make sure that our armaments are in good condition, and that is the reason for the increase in the Defense budget. . . .

But while we have been becoming stronger in the sense that we now have bigger bombs than we had 10 years ago, and we have better weapons, we have not been becoming more secure. So that although in the absence of enforcible arms limitation agreements, we have to keep on with our half of the arms race, I do not think that we should believe that that is, in fact, going to make us secure in an absolute sense. It may, and I think it will, and has, prevented a deliberate attack on us by the Soviets.

But if it does not prevent diffusion of nuclear weapons, I do not see that it will, and if it builds up more armament on both sides we cannot really feel secure.

—Newly released Senate Armed Services hearings, p. 480.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If Arevalo Was An Extreme Leftist, FDR Was An Anarcho-Syndicalist

(Continued from Page One)

though United Fruit lost none of its lands to agrarian reform while Arévalo was President and though it took four years for him just to legalize agricultural trade unions, Arévalo figures in our newspapers as "an extreme Leftist." If Arévalo was an "extreme Leftist", Franklin D. Roosevelt was an Anarcho-Syndicalist.

Technology Marches On At Last

At Costa Rica, Mr. Kennedy said we and the six Central American governments would "build a wall around Cuba . . . a wall of dedicated men determined to protect their own freedom and sovereignty." Of the six countries, two are now plain military dictatorships; two, Panama and El Salvador, are ruled by hated oligarchies; only two, Costa Rica and Honduras, have freely elected popular governments. Their secret service chiefs met together in Nicaragua to erect an Iron Curtain around Cuba, to apply stricter police state methods to their own people. This was a wall not of dedicated men but of Little Metternichs. In one sphere at least these backward countries have now come fully abreast of us. "Representatives of the Central American and U.S. governments" the *AP* reported from Managua April 5, "recommended last night that their citizens be kept out of Cuba by stamping their passports, 'Not Valid for Travel to Cuba.' The U.S. uses the same system to bar Americans from Red China." Thus technology marches on. But how keep Latin American youth from asking, "If conditions in Cuba are as bad as the U.S. says, why is it so anxious to keep us from seeing for ourselves?"

We Americans used to pride ourselves on being a plain spoken people. But the windy euphemism affects our relations with all the world. An example, around which the annual legislative battle has begun, is the case of foreign aid. Most of this is really an annex to our military budget. The Clay committee reported that 72% of this year's foreign aid went in direct military or related economic assistance to maintain 2,000,000 men under arms along the Sino-Soviet border. The Committee calls this "the frontier of freedom." It is in fact almost entirely a chain of military dictatorships. The otherwise chilly Clay committee gives this part of the program warm support, though it recommends some cuts, particularly where "sophisticated weapons" are going to armies "of value largely for internal security purposes." Ordinary guns and tanks are good enough to hold people down. The humane aspects of foreign aid are only a thin sugarcoating on a Pentagon pill. Since the Marshall Plan ended, we have spent $50 billion on foreign aid. Of this, $30 billion went for armament, another $15 billion to bolster the economies of those same dictatorships so they could support such large armies. Of the remaining $5 billion, $3.5 went for development, $1.5 for technical assistance. Thus of every dollar of foreign aid, only 10 cents went for constructive purposes, 90 cents for military. No wonder we can no longer afford to speak plainly. Unfortunately the validity of free speech, free elections and free institutions suffers in the minds of a whole new generation from our abuse of fine words for shabby purposes.

The Bitter View From Below The Border

"In 1914 Henry Ford fixed the minimum salary of his workers at $5 a day. In 1945 these same Yankee workers had their own automobiles, refrigerators, television, libraries. On the other hand our workers continued under an enslaving feudal agriculture which ground men up until they were dregs. On beginning my presidency, in 1954, visiting a coffee growing area, I personally verified the fact that field workers were earning 4 cents a day. I spoke with one of them. He was married, and had 5 children. His wife had lost almost all her teeth. The children had neither school nor medicines. Our popular Guatemalan revolution offered workers a minimum salary, schools and hospitals. Thus began our "komunismo." * No one ever called Henry Ford a "komunista"; his North American workers belong to another race and another political zone of the world. The workers of the south, on the other hand, are regarded as human material of the second class, and of their low salaries is created the prosperity of others, some in the U.S. and others here in Latin America."

—Juan José Arévalo: AntiKomunismo en America Latina (Buenos Aires, 1959).

*A term coined by the former President of Guatemala to satirize the tendency of "gendarme government," the U.S. and the Catholic Church in his country to label Red all who favor social reform.

Don't Forget 1962 Index Now Available Free If You Send Long Stamped Self-Addressed Envelope

I.F. Stone's Bi-Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

4/15/63

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I.F. Stone's Bi-Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every other Monday at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent bi-weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED